

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figures 1-7 were rejected by the Examiner for including shading which obscured the drawings and text of the drawings.

A complete set of corrected drawings for figures 1-7 is submitted herewith.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-18, 32-50 and 61-63 were rejected by the Examiner. More specifically:

- Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 15-18, 32-36, 39-42, 48-50 and 61-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0153509 (*Alcorn*).
- Claims 6, 7, 10-14, 37, 38 and 43-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Alcorn* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0126745 (*Bell*).
- Claims 61-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 3, 9, 13, 15, 34, 42, 46, 49 and 62 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 32, 35-41, 43, 44, 47, 48, 61 and 63 have been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments. Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14, 16-18, 32, 33, 35-41, 43-45, 47, 48, 50, 61 and 63 will remain pending. For the reasons set forth below. Applicants request that the above-listed rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14 and 16-18

Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by *Alcorn* because *Alcorn* fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 1. See MPEP §2131 (stating that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in the single prior art reference). More particularly, Applicants submit that *Alcorn* fails to disclose, among other things, “displaying the learning reinforcement signal on the display **at substantially the same time that the response is compared with the one or more answers**” as recited in amended claim 1.

Alcorn is directed to a system that provides a plurality of users with access to a plurality of on-line courses. Each user is assigned a role, such as student, teacher or administrator, which determines his or her level of access and use. The *Alcorn* system comprises communication and collaboration tools such as discussion boards, chat tools and online exams. The *Alcorn* system

provides instant feedback to students for online assessments through automatic grading functionality. *See Alcorn* at ¶0223.

In contrast, amended claim 1 requires that a learning reinforcement signal be displayed on the teacher's computer system at substantially the same time that a student's response is compared with one or more answers. As such, the system allows monitoring by the teacher of the current student responses and provides an indication of the correctness of the answers. ¶0035. *Alcorn* does not teach or suggest providing real time feedback to teachers. *Alcorn* merely teaches providing real time feedback to students once a test has been completed.

As such, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by *Alcorn* because *Alcorn* fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1. *See* MPEP §2131. Applicants further submit that claims 2, 4, 5, 8 and 16-18, which depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, are also patentable over *Alcorn*. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicants request that the §102(e) rejections associated with claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 16-18 be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 7, 10-12 and 14 depend from amended independent claim 1. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is nonobvious over *Alcorn* in view of *Bell* because the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. *See* MPEP §2143 (stating that one of the elements of a prima facie case of obviousness under §103(a) is that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations).

For reasons similar to those set forth hereinabove with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that *Alcorn* fails to teach or suggest, among other things, "displaying the learning reinforcement signal on the display at substantially the same time that the response is compared with the one or more answers."

Bell fails to resolve the deficiencies of *Alcorn*. *Bell* is directed to a system and method for improving a student's math performance. A student enters an answer to a math problem that is displayed on the student's computer, and the invention determines whether the response is correct. The system includes a database that records each problem presented to the student and every response received from the student. This information is used to generate statistics which parents, teachers or other parties can view to track a student's progress. The problem session may be run from a centralized location and distributed to a number of students via a computer network. ¶0066. The students' responses may then be recorded at the centralized location.

However, unlike claim 1, *Bell* does not teach or suggest the use of real time communication between students and instructors. Rather, *Bell* merely records responses that are reviewed at a later time. As such, *Bell* does not teach or suggest, among other things, “displaying the learning reinforcement signal on the display at substantially the same time that the response is compared with the one or more answers” as recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 is nonobvious over the combination of *Alcorn* and *Bell* because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. *See* MPEP §2143. Applicants further submit that claims 6, 7, 10-12 and 14, which depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, are also nonobvious over the cited references. *See* MPEP §2143.03 (stating that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious). Accordingly, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicants request that the §103(a) rejections associated with claims 6, 7, 10-12 and 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 32, 33, 35-41, 43-45, 47, 48 and 50

Applicants submit that amended independent claim 32 is not anticipated by *Alcorn* because *Alcorn* fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 32. *See* MPEP §2131. More particularly, Applicants submit that *Alcorn* fails to disclose, among other things, “displaying the learning reinforcement signal on the display at substantially the same time that the learning reinforcement signal is received” as recited in amended claim 32.

For substantially the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that *Alcorn* fails to disclose, among other things, “displaying the learning reinforcement signal on the display at substantially the same time that the learning reinforcement signal is received” as recited in amended claim 32. As such, Applicants submit that amended claim 32 is not anticipated by *Alcorn* because *Alcorn* fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 32. *See* MPEP §2131. Applicants further submit that claims 33, 35, 36, 39-41, 48 and 50, which depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 32, are also patentable over *Alcorn*. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicants request that the §102(e) rejections associated with claims 32, 33, 35, 36, 39-41, 48 and 50 be withdrawn.

Claims 37, 38, 43-45 and 47 depend from amended independent claim 32. For substantially the same reasons set forth hereinabove with respect to claims 6, 7, 10-12 and 14,

Applicants submit that *Alcorn* and *Bell*, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every limitation of amended claim 32.

As such, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 32 is nonobvious over the combination of *Alcorn* and *Bell* because the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 32. *See* MPEP §2143. Applicants further submit that claims 37, 38, 43-45 and 47, which depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 32, are also nonobvious over the cited references. *See* MPEP §2143.03. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicants request that the §103(a) rejections associated with claims 37, 38, 43-45 and 47 be withdrawn.

Claims 61 and 63

The Examiner rejected claims 61 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claims did not produce a physical transformation or a useful, concrete and tangible result. Claim 61 has been amended to include the limitation “displaying a first reinforcement signal on the teacher computer system at substantially the same time that the response is compared with the one or more answers,” which describes a useful, concrete and tangible result. Claim 63 depends from and incorporates the limitations of claim 61. Accordingly, in light of the amendments, Applicants request that the §101 rejections associated with claims 61 and 63 be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that amended independent claim 61 is not anticipated by *Alcorn* because *Alcorn* fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 61. *See* MPEP §2131. More particularly, Applicants submit that *Alcorn* fails to disclose, among other things, “displaying a first reinforcement signal on the teacher computer system at substantially the same time that the response is compared with the one or more answers,” as recited in amended claim 61.

For substantially the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that *Alcorn* fails to disclose, among other things, “displaying a first reinforcement signal on the teacher computer system at substantially the same time that the response is compared with the one or more answers,” as recited in claim 61. As such, Applicants submit that amended claim 61 is not anticipated by *Alcorn* because *Alcorn* fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 61. *See* MPEP §2131. Applicants further submit that claim 63, which depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 61, are also patentable over *Alcorn*.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicants request that the §102(c) rejections associated with claims 61 and 63 be withdrawn.


All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. There being no other rejections, Applicants respectfully request that the current application be allowed and passed to issue.

If the Examiner believes for any reason that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, I invite the Examiner to telephone me directly.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Amendment and Response, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account no. 50-0436.

Respectfully submitted,
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP


Joseph T. Helmsen
Registration No. 54,163

Pepper Hamilton LLP
One Mellon Center, 50th Floor
500 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: 412.454.5000
Facsimile: 412.281.0717
Date: December 20, 2006